

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-59 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52 were amended. Consequently, claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-59 remain pending.

Independent claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52 were amended to recite that “the server maintains a database of web site identifiers that are categorized by environmental factors, and queries the database using the environment information to determine web sites most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device in that environment,” and that “server policies determine which web site identifiers are sent to the device.” Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, see for example pages 5, 7, and 9. Accordingly, no new matter has been submitted.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7, 9-10, 15-16, 19, 21-22, 24, 28, 31, 33-34, 36, 39, 41-42, 44, 47, 49-50, 52, 55, and 57-58 under 35 USC §103 (a) is being unpatentable over Rosen et al. (U.S. 6,014, 090) in view of Shoji et al. (U.S. 6,564, 254). Claims 5, 17, 29, 37, 45, and 53 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji in view of Martin Jr. et al. (U.S. 6,363,419). Claims 6, 18, 30, 38, 46 and 54 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji in view of Wynblatt et al. (U.S. 6,219,696). Claims 11, 23, 35, 43, 51 and 59 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-Shoji in view of Perrone et al. (U.S. 6,157,705).

Rosen is directed to a method and apparatus for providing a user of a mobile communication system with geographically localized information that is time-dependent. A geographic location identifier associated with a location of the mobile communication system is received by a server. An address of a resource server is associated with the geographic location identifier, and the address of the resource server is then sent to the mobile communication system

(Summary).

The Examiner is correct in pointing out that Rosen, the primary reference, does not explicitly teach the step of using the identifiers for lookahead data entry. To cure this defect of Rosen, the Examiner cites Shoji for teaching lookahead data entry.

Shoji is directed to a system and process for specifying a location on a network by monitoring typed input from a keyboard at the address field of a browser. If an input character/symbol is found in a cache file, the URLs corresponding to the character/symbol are passed to the browser and displayed to allow the user to choose one URL therefrom. In the case where only one URL is found, a browser is launched and the matching URL is passed to the browser.

A combination of Rosen and Shoji, singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the amended claims of the present invention. For example, neither Rosen or Shoji teach a database of web site identifiers that are *categorized by environmental factors*, as recited in the independent claims. Nor does Rosen-Shoji teach that the server “queries the database using the environment information to determine web sites most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device in that environment.” In addition, nothing in Rosen-Shoji teach or suggest that “server policies determine which web site identifiers are sent to the device.”


With respect to the recited lookahead step, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is reading this step of the claim in isolation and fails to consider the claim as a whole, as required for a proper §103 rejection. Shoji merely teaches well-known typeahead features that are common with Web browsers in which suggestions for web sites are based on previous requests from the user. In the claims of the present invention, however, the identifiers that are the subject of the lookahead feature are transparently sent to the device by a server based on environment information, rather than being entered by the user. Accordingly, applicant maintains that Shoji

fails to teach or suggest "using the identifiers for lookahead data entry, wherein a user is not required to have previously entered the identifiers," as recited independent claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not teach or suggest the combination of features and limitations recited in the independent claims. In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 12, 24, 36, 44, and 52 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, the dependent claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-19, 21-39, 41-47, 49-55, 57-59 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes that this Application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 493-4540

March 4, 2004